



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,642	02/25/2002	Michael B. McLeod	2020310	3662	
34018 7	590 03/01/2005		EXAMINER		
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP .77 WEST WACKER DRIVE			LUONG, SHIAN TINH NHAN		
SUITE 2500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60601-1732			3728		
			DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<del></del>	Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/082	2,642	MCLEOD ET AL.				
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
		Shian 7	T. Luong	3728				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE MAILING - Extensions of tin after SIX (6) MO - If the period for r - If NO period for r - Faiture to reply w Any reply receive	ED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR DATE OF THIS COMMUNING THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNING THE PROPERTY OF	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no unication. o) days, a reply within the tutory period will apply an will, by statute, cause the	event, however, may a reply be statutory minimum of thirty (30) of d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr application to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timel om the mailing date of this co NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.			
Status								
1)⊠ Respon	sive to communication(s) file	d on <i>14 July 2004</i>		•				
2a)⊠ This ac	, ,	2b)☐ This action i			•			
3)☐ Since th	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
Disposition of C	laims		,					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Pape	ers							
9)☐ The spe	cification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachment(s)			<b>□</b>	(5.1.0)				
2) Notice of Drafts	ences Cited (PTO-892) person's Patent Drawing Review (P closure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or iil Date		4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		<b>ン-152)</b>			

Page 2

Art Unit: 3728

Application/Control Number: 10/082,642

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "at least one shipping tray" in claim 2 is not consistent with the two shipping trays as recited in claim 1.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-12, 14-16 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (US 5,390,847) or Muise, Jr. (US 6,354,487) in view of Flanagan et al. (US 6,050,419) and Bullock and Day (US 4,865,202). Young discloses a system comprising at least one shipping unit, each shipping unit has at least two substantially open topped trays 10. Each of the tray is configured to be capable of being stacked atop another of the at lest two trays by stacking tabs 22 and apertures 42. Each tray having a top, two sides 14,16 and a bottom 12. A cover 28 is operably configured to be positioned atop the uppermost one of the two open-topped shipping trays. The cover is substantially a pad with apertures 30 configured to receive the tab 22. Each shipping tray has a substantially the same top plan configuration and the cover has a plan configuration substantially the same as each of the two trays. The cover has a shoe box type lid configuration. Muise, Jr. discloses stackable trays and lids. The open topped trays have tabs

Application/Control Number: 10/082,642

Art Unit: 3728

38 to engage the apertures in the lid. Young or Muises does not disclose a binding member. But Flanagan et al. discloses a substantially flat, thin binding member 10 made out of paperboard material that is configured to wrap around 4 different areas of stacked articles. Similarly, Bullock teaches adhesively attach a binding strip to secure stacked articles. With regard to the orientation of the strip, Day teaching binding the stacked article from the top cover to the two sides to the bottom of the lowermost stacked tray. Hence, it would have been obvious in view of Flanagan et a. and Bullock and Day to provide a binding member that secures the stacked articles during shipment.

It would also have bee obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to make the binding band out of metal or plastic, the shipping tray and cover out of corrugated paperboard material or plastic, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its sutiability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

4. Claim 13 is finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references applied above with respect to claim 1, further in view of Corrugated Common Footprint. Although Young or Muise, Jr. shows identical stackable trays, it would have been obvious to stack other non-similar trays with alignable tabs. This is shown by Corrugated Common Footprint wherein a smaller stackable tray is on a top portion of a larger stackable tray. Hence, interchange different stackable tray are within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/082,642

Art Unit: 3728

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/14/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Telephone inquiries regarding the status of applications or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners, M.P.E.P. 203.08.

Application/Control Number: 10/082,642

Art Unit: 3728

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Erica Miller at (571) 272-4370.

For applicant's convenience, the official FAX number is (703) 872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify Examiner Luong of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries concerning the merits of the examination should be directed to Shian Luong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4557. The examiner can normally be reached on M-H from 7:00am to 4:00pm EST.

STL February 28, 2005 Shian Luong Art Unit 3728